

MAY 02 2007

U.S.S.N. 09/732,837

6

PD-990309

**REMARKS**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated March 8, 2007, claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration of the claims.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-3, 10, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The antecedent basis for all of the rejections was believed to be overcome by the amendments above. The "the" was replaced with "a" or "an" in each instance in claims 1, 2, 10, 18 and 19.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 3, 5 8-10 and 13-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adiwoso et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,067,453) in view of Schiff et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,233,456). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a communications system 10 that is best shown in Figure 1. The communications system 10 includes a first teleport station 20 that is described in the second full paragraph of page 4. A first user terminal 16 is also included in Claim 1. The user terminal is set forth in the first full paragraph of page 4. As stated, the user terminals may include various consumer and business-type applications.

U.S.S.N. 09/732,837

7

PD-990309

Claim 1 further includes a satellite 18 coupling the first teleport station 20 to the first user terminal 16. The satellite is first described in the first full paragraph of page 4. A network access point 21 is directly coupled to the Internet. The network access point is also directly coupled to the first teleport station 20 through an optical fiber 23. The coupling of the teleport station and the network access point is described in paragraph 2 of page 4.

The Examiner states that the Adiwoso reference does not explicitly disclose that the network access point 37 is coupled to the first teleport station through an optical fiber. The Examiner cites the Schiff reference for teaching the network access point directly coupled to the first teleport station through an optical fiber. The Examiner points to Figure 1, column 8 and lines 50-67 through column 9, lines 1-12. The Examiner states that based on this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the network access point directly coupled to the first teleport station through an optical fiber as taught by Schiff in the system of Adiwoso et al. While it is true that the communication 162 includes an optical fiber link as one example, the link in the Schiff reference connects gateway 120 to a command center mobile telephone switching office (MTSO). The Schiff reference is specifically directed to a mobile telephone system. As described in the sentence bridging paragraphs 8 and 9, "exemplary elements used in such controllers are mobile telephone switching offices (MTSOs), which include interface and processing circuitry for controlling routing of telephone calls between a public switched telephone network (PSTN) and gateways. The MTSO is, thus, connected to the PSTN and not to the Internet. Therefore, the Schiff reference fails to teach "a network access point directly coupled to an Internet and directly coupled to the first teleport station through an optical fiber. The Examiner admits that the Adiwoso reference fails to teach the network access point directly coupled to the first teleport

U.S.S.N. 09/732,837

8

PD-990309

station through an optical fiber. Applicants respectfully submit the network access point and the MTSO are not the same. Therefore, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest a network access point directly coupled to the Internet and directly coupled to the first teleport station through an optical fiber. It appears that the Examiner is selectively picking and choosing between elements in hindsight to form the elements of claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection. Claims 2 and 3 recite further limitations of claim 1 and, therefore, these claims are believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Claim 5 is an independent claim directed to a method of communicating between a first user terminal and a first geographic region served by a first satellite and a second user terminal in a second geographic region. Claim 5 recites the steps of directing a communication from a first user terminal to the first satellite 18, routing the communication from the first satellite 18 to the first teleport station 20 and routing the communication from the first teleport station 20 to a second teleport station 20 in the second geographic region by way of an optical fiber network 38. Claim 5 also recites the step of routing the communication from the second teleport station 20 to a second user terminal in the second geographic region. This is generally set forth in the first full paragraph of page 7.

The Examiner points to Figs. 5 and 6 of the Adiwoso reference for disclosing multiple satellite stations connected via fiber links. Applicants respectfully submit that Figs. 5 and 6 merely illustrate a number of satellites above a portion of the earth that illustrate coverage regions. There is no teaching or suggestion in either the Adiwoso reference or Schiff reference that directs a communication from a first user terminal to a satellite and then routes the communication from the satellite to a first teleport station then to a second teleport station in a second geographical region by way of an optical fiber network. Adiwoso is merely a satellite-

U.S.S.N. 09/732,837

9

PD-990309

type system. The Schiff reference does disclose both a satellite and an optical fiber. However, the optical fiber merely couples the gateway and the MTSO. The Examiner again points to column 8, line 50 through column 9, line 12 for teaching a first teleport station and a second teleport station communicating by way of an optical fiber network. While an optical fiber is set forth as an example of the communication link 162, it appears that the MTSO is merely coupled to each gateway through the communication link 162. There is no teaching that the gateways communicate through the optical fiber. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claim 5. Likewise, claim 8 depends from claim 5 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Claim 9 is also an independent claim directed to a method of operating a communication system. Claim 9 recites "generating a plurality of spot beams directed to a respective plurality of teleport stations from a satellite, interconnecting the plurality of teleport stations with the optical communication network; in normal operating conditions, directing a communication from a first of said teleport stations through said satellite, when the first teleport station is encumbered, directing the communications through an optical link, and, directing the communication to the satellite from the second teleport station."

Claim 9 includes further limitations to claim 1 with respect to the normal operating conditions encumbering the first teleport station and the like. These specific recitations are not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. Applicants believe that, in addition to the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 9 is also believed to be allowable. Likewise, claims 10 and 13-19 depend from claims 9 and 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

U.S.S.N. 09/732,837

10

PD-990309

Claims 2, 6, 7, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adiwoso et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,067,453) in view of Schiff et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,233,456) and further in view of Wiedeman (U.S. Pat. No. 5,896,558). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of claims 2, 6, 7, 11 and 12 are dependent claims that further limit their respective independent claims. The Wiedeman reference does not teach or suggest the elements missing as described with respect to claims 1, 5 and 9. Therefore, these claims are also believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adiwoso et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,067,453) in view of Schiff et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,233,456) and further in view of Acampora (U.S. Pat. No. 6,049,593). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 4, a communication system as recited that includes a satellite, first teleport station, an optical fiber network, and a second teleport station coupled to the first teleport station through the optical fiber network and the satellite. The optical fiber network provides a primary communication link until an irregularity is detected in the optical fiber, where, upon the sensing of the irregularity, the communication is routed from the first teleport station to the second teleport station through the satellite. It should be pointed out that the primary communication recited in claim 4 is an optical fiber with the satellite back-up. The Examiner points to Rowe (column 20, lines 50-67) for the back-up feature. However, it is land line back-up for the satellite system that is set forth. Claim 4 specifically recites the optical system as the primary while the back-up system is the satellite system.

The Examiner admits that the Adiwoso and the Schiff references do not teach routing the communication from the first teleport station to the second teleport station through the satellite

U.S.S.N. 09/732,837

11

PD-990309

when an irregularity is detected in the optical fiber. As mentioned above with respect to the Schiff reference, the MTSO and each gateway station are coupled together. However, the first teleport station and the second teleport station do not appear to communicate over the optical fiber. Likewise, although the Acampora reference teaches switching from millimeter wave to optical fiber, and vice versa, there is no teaching or suggestion for using this type of communication from the first teleport station and a second teleport station. Likewise, there is no teaching for employing a satellite to provide such communications. The communications are described as millimeter wave not "microwave" as described by the Examiner at the end of page 7. This clearly suggests that the communications are outside the realm of satellite communication. Therefore, the combination of Adiwoso, Schiff and Acampora do not form claim 4. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection as well.

MAY 02 2007

U.S.S.N. 09/732,837

12

PD-990309

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the remarks above, Applicants submit that all objections and rejections are now overcome. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Should any fees be associated with this submission, please charge Deposit Account 50-0383.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 2, 2007

By: 

Georgann S. Grunebach, Reg. No. 33,179  
Attorney for Applicants

The DIRECTV Group, Inc.  
CA/LA1/A109  
2230 East Imperial Highway  
P.O. Box 956  
El Segundo, CA 90245  
Telephone: (310) 964-4615